The Protestant Episcopal Church Menaced by Two Grave Crises

Constitution and Canons Overridden
Submission to Rome Demanded

The Torok Case
The Church Unity Octave

(Reprinted from the February, 1936, issue of The Chronicle by special request and for wider distribution)

At the Cross Roads

DURING December, 1935, The Protestant Episcopal Church experienced two grave crises, unique in its history of one hundred and fifty years. The sure foundations of the ecclesiastical fabric have been badly shaken.

The first affects governmental integrity, the attack being directed against the Constitution and Canons of this Church.

The Torok-Wilson-Eau Claire incident has become a cause celebre.

Prior to General Convention (1934) a group were seeking recognition of Torok's orders and aspirations for a place in the Protestant Episcopal House of Bishops. "The Chronicle" sensed the danger of it and warned the Church and its leaders.

A small group of muddy-minded ecclesiastics for specific reasons sought and still seek to infuse into our Episcopal order a theological and governmental strain alien alike to its history and ideals,—a type so undesirable that it cannot be assimilated.

General Convention decided against the group and the Diocese of Eau Claire. It refused confirmation of said Torok as its Suffragan. In accordance with all precedents this decision was final.

However, responding to unwise counsellors the Presiding Bishop, Dr. Perry, took action both unprecedented and unconstitutional. He appointed a committee of three Bishops to review the former evidence with the object of reversing the decision of General Convention. Its findings were that the Torok consecration was "valid" but "irregular." Not a new idea,—not a bright one. An ex-parte statement. In the form of a report endeavor was made to force the issue at the meeting of the House of Bishops at Dallas in November. The report of the committee was ignored. Therefore the decision of General Convention was not challenged. It stands.

Shortly after this set-back in early December, the Bishop of Eau Claire did something (?) and Torok was installed as a Suffragan Bishop with a dubious authority to exercise Episcopal functions in the Diocese of Eau Claire. The Presiding Bishop, we are informed, was implicated. He also appointed about this time, without explanation, Dr. Wilson a member of the Committee on Canons. Anglo-Catholic Dr. Frank Gavin, G. T. S., we are informed was also an intimate adviser.

This act of defiance disregarded the will of General Convention, the implicit provisions of the Constitution of this Church and its Canons.

It thoroughly aroused three of our Bishops,—Drs. Mann, Manning and Ward. They issued an open letter to the Presiding Bishop. They stated their objections. The message was direct and frank. The reply of the P. B. was indirect, inadequate. He said something about "the American Episcopal Church",—a non-existent institution. He passed on all responsibility to the Bishop of Eau Claire.

The publicity given the statement revealed to Church members the inside story. They were amazed by this circuitous attack upon their governmental system.

Dr. Perry's reply was so evasive and unsatisfactory that the three original objectors, Drs. Manning, Mann and Ward, secured the co-operation of Bishops Francis, Johnson, Matthews and Oldham. A second open letter to the Presiding Bishop was issued and sent to all Bishops. It carried specific charges involving doubt as to the validity of the Torok orders and also called attention to certain financial transactions which should be investigated. It reinforced the previous demand upon the Presiding Bishop for action. It did not admit that he could shift his burden to the shoulders of Bishop Wilson. The circular was sent to all Bishops requesting them to vote on one of two propositions. (1) To demand that Bishop Wilson promise to restrain Dr. Torok from exercising any Episcopal functions until the next regular meeting of the House of Bishops, or (2) to require the Presiding Bishop to call a special meeting at an early date of the House to consider this whole procedure in all of its complicated references. "The Chronicle" received a telegram (Jan. 24) stating fifty-one Bishops had voted for the first proposition.

A certain Church weekly announces in its last issue that Bishop Wilson has promised that Dr. Torok will not be allowed to officiate.

Honor is especially due to the three Bishops, Drs. Manning, Mann and Ward, who have fought valiantly to guard our Episcopate from irregularities and an unwarranted invasion.

More dramatic and even of more tragic significance was the public press story carried on (Dec. 26) that a group within the Protestant Episcopal Church was Romeward bent and was carrying on an insidious under-cover conspiracy. The story was spread by press service throughout the country. For over a week the story held a prominent place in the papers and found its place throughout the religious press of the country. There can be no doubt concerning the significant proportions of this secret movement. A representative of The Church Unity Octave Council has been in contact since last October with a prominent Roman Catholic leader and institution. These disloyal members of the group advise against individual submission to Rome. They prefer John Henry Newman's plan to work and wait until a significant number are ready to submit to the implacable will of the Roman system. The fact that these Anglo-Catholics have no official status is beside the mark. Such a group does not need such backing. They prefer to work in secret,—always do. The Council members responsible for the now well known circular signed by Franklin Joiner have a backing of individuals and agencies of surprising proportions, even involving the richest parish in the Protestant Episcopal Church. Those "higher up" never appear in the front line, when the temperature shoots up, they are in some cool calm corner. The smaller fellows take the punishment.

It is practically a foregone conclusion that if the story had not been carried before the "Court of Public Opinion" by the daily papers, the Council would have carried on, no members would have resigned, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, its loyal Bishops, clergy and laity would have gone on for a time longer living in a fool's paradise, while conspirators were tunnelling the foundations of our Church preparatory to destroying them beyond repair. We remind our readers that "The Chronicle" in this issue carries the Church Unity Octave Council's specific and general plan, considering it an unparalleled attempt to wreck the faith of loyal Protestant Episcopalians in the government, doctrine, discipline and worship of the Church they love. Unqualified condemnation of the individuals and group connected with the C. U. O. C. would indeed be gentle treatment.

For an individual or an institution to be faced with one serious problem "At the Cross-Roads" is a challenge that requires clear thinking and abundant courage.

The Protestant Episcopal Church now faces (1) The Torok Case, which assails our governmental integrity and (2) The Church Unity Octave conspiracy which would, if not thwarted, betray us and turn us over to the tender mercies of the Church of Rome.

"Lord have mercy upon us!"

The Church Unity Octave Council

Traffic with Rome—Submission its Purpose

THE publication in the public press of the purposes of this seditious movement has created such a feeling of amazed resentment against the group of Churchmen responsible for it that *The Chronicle* feels that it will do its readers a favor by revealing to them the whole story in detail.

The Church Unity Octave is a movement started in 1908 by the Rev. Paul James Francis, then a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the Rev. Spencer Jones of the Church of England. The Octave is celebrated from January 18th to the 25th, beginning at "The Feast of St. Peter's Chair at Rome" and including "The Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul"—the first event belonging to the Roman Catholic Church. In 1909 Francis joined the Roman Church and is now known as Father Paul James Francis, S.A., and is the Superior of the Franciscan Friars of the Atonement at Garrison, New York.

The present Church Unity Octave Council has as officers Rev. Franklin Joiner, Chairman; Rev. H. Baxter Liebler, Vice-Chairman; Theodore C. Vermilye, Secretary; and Paul A. Farley, Treasurer. Twenty-nine names appear as members of the American Committee. Seven of these are laymen.

The affair came to public attention when this Committee sent out a circular letter, a post-card ballot and a pamphlet to 1,500 clergy (including all the Bishops) of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and this material was published in the New York *Times* (December 26). The letter was signed by the Rev. Franklin Joiner on December 1, 1935.

The letter contains the following interesting points. After quoting from the statement issued by the Bishops at Lambeth in 1920 to the effect that "There can be no fulfilment of the Divine Purpose in the Scheme of Reunion which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West", the members of the Church Unity Octave Council "devoutly hope that from January 18th to January 25th, 1936, many hundreds of Priests will join with the millions of the Faithful who will then be praying for Catholic Unity, and will fervently beseech God that the will of Our Lord, 'Ut Omnes Unum Sint', may be done."

It should be noted that the appeal is to hold these devotions at the time scheduled by and peculiar to the Roman Church and is entirely alien to all Protestant Churches.

The post-card sent with this letter displayed three pledges which were to be checked by the person receiving the card.

The first reads: "I will observe the Octave by using the official prayers daily and by offering Holy Mass with intention". The second: "The Octave will be publicly observed in my parish; the third: "You may publish my name as a participant."

The leaflet which was to afford the reason for these pledges contains the following statements:

1. "The Church Unity Octave is observed every year from The Feast of S. Peter's Chair at Rome, January 18th, to the Feast of the Conversion of S. Paul, January 25th."
2. "It is only by the Reunion of All Christians into the one Visible Kingdom of Christ, symbolized by the Chair of St. Peter, the Central See of Christendom at Rome, that the power of the Church can be directed, without the present waste and rivalry to the conversion of the whole world, by the One True Faith, to Christ the King."
3. The Daily Intentions:

January 18. "The *Feast of Saint Peter's Chair at Rome.* The return of all the 'other sheep' to the One Fold under the One Shepherd." This is followed by seven other intentions covering the Eastern Churches, Anglicans, Lutherans, Calvinists and all other European Protestants, "the submission of all Christians in America to the Authority of Holy Church, "The return to the Sacraments of all lapsed Catholics", "the conversion of Jews", and "the missionary conquest of the whole world for Christ the King". All implies submission to Rome.

4. (Under Recommendations). "Priests should say Mass daily for the official intentions."
5. Laymen should pray "for the triumph of the True Faith and the liberty and exaltation of Holy Mother Church throughout the World", "should offer a penance, a fast, the Stations of the Cross, a decade of the Rosary or some other devotion, each day, for the particular intention of the day; and "offer prayers or Mass intention, at least once a week, for the Reunion of all Christians, especially those of the Anglican Communion, with the Holy Apostolic Roman See."
6. Additional Prayers:

"O God, who didst bestow upon thy Blessed Apostle S. Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven and didst appoint unto Him the Priesthood for the binding and loosing of sin . . . . grant by the help of His intercession we may be delivered from the bonds of all our iniquities and . . . . we beseech Thee . . . . to pour out upon all Christian people Thy Grace of unity and concord, all divisions being done away, they may be joined to the true Shepherd of Thy Church."

This clear statement of a wish to unite with, that is submit to Rome shows the utter discontent of the signers of the letter with the protestantism of our Church. It is however made the clearer by the amazing statement later in the leaflet which runs "Protestantism . . . . is bankrupt ethically, culturally, morally and religiously. Its driving force, negative at best, has exhausted itself, and it has ceased to attract or to inspire. The forces of the day have proved too strong for Protestantism and it is disintegrating rapidly." The "fiasco of prohibition" is even laid at the doors of Protestantism.

The resentment against Protestantism and the yearning toward Rome is further evidenced by the additional statement that "As Anglicans, we are rooted deep in Catholicism but we have been tarred, especially in this country, with the protestant brush. Let us beware lest, when the time of sifting is at hand, we are not found on the side of the Saints and the Angels."

After all this it is not surprising to find these twenty-nine people asserting that "The brunt of the anti-Christian attack

beyond. Even a Paris paper carried the story. The vast majority of members, clerical and lay, of the Protestant Episcopal Church were outraged. Leaders of the great Protestant Churches were perplexed and actively resentful. As reported in the *New York Evening Telegram,* there was cooing in the dovecotes of the Vatican. The alert Jesuit Editor of *America* sensed the significance of the circular and declared it a "clear-headed" statement, and from his viewpoint, so it was. *The Catholic World* made a two page story of it and included an announcement that Rome never changes and any approach to her involved complete submission.

Within the Protestant Episcopal Church, apparently, the most appropriate interpretations were that the movement was "seditious", "inaccurate", "unhistoric", an "insult" to that great body of Protestant Churches of which we are a part. Upon constitutional grounds it was stated that any parish whose rector was involved could through its vestry demand of the Diocesan authorities, i. e., its Bishop and Standing Committee, the dissolution of the pastoral relation and that Cathedral Trustees could initiate a similar procedure.

The Bishops Speak

In view of the serious issues involved, the seditious encouragements and purely Roman Catholic practices suggested, all contrary to the genius of the Protestant Episcopal Church, *The Chronicle* felt impelled to send a circular letter to the Bishop of each Diocese in the United States. The experiment has been most successful. Letters have been received to date from 62 Bishops. One who spoke with great frankness later sends a registered letter reminding us that his letter is personal. One Bishop alone refused a direct answer. Otherwise the uniform courtesy and frankness of our Episcopate should be encouraging to the vast majority of the clergy and laity.

Our Letter

January 6, 1936.

My dear Bishop . . . . . :

Before me there is a copy of a letter written to you by The Rev. Franklin Joiner. You are addressed as "Most Reverend Father", a designation used by the Roman Catholic Church in addressing its Bishops. Their Monsignors are now called "The Right Reverend."

This letter seeks to enlist your sympathy and cooperation in imposing upon our Church the Roman Catholic observance of the Church Unity Octave. It ends with this request, "The Council begs your blessing and your observance of the Octave and would greatly appreciate receiving your approval of our venture."

May I ask you very frankly,—

1. **Have you bestowed your blessing upon the Unity Octave Movement?**
2. **Have you observed the Octave or have you counselled any or all of your clergy to do the same?**
3. **Have you communicated to the Council or any of its members your approval of the "venture"?**

I would appreciate very much any comment you have to make in reference to this Unity Octave Movement.

This letter also is being sent to a selected group of the Bishops of our Church. May you find it convenient to answer it in the near future! For your convenience a return stamped addressed envelope is enclosed.

Assuring you of my personal regard, believe me,
Faithfully yours,
AGCummins **Alexander G. Cummins.**
BL

Bishop Abbott, Lexington: 1-2-3—"No, I have not". "Strongly opposed to any irresponsible body of Churchmen presuming . . . . to speak for the Church as a whole . . . . All Bishops and priests are equally committed to the rules of decency and order."

Bishop Barnwell, Georgia: "Personally, I am not much in favor of going back to Rome . . . . "

Bishop Bartlett, North Dakota: Questions 1-2-3, "No, I have no use for such a movement."

Bishop Beecher, Nebraska: A. U. P. dispatch gave the Octave story to the Hastings (Neb.) *Daily Tribune.* Dr. Beecher sends us his reply appearing in that paper. We quote: ". . . . authorities of the Roman Catholic Church are in no way disturbed or particularly elated." "It is also my conviction that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America is equally undisturbed." "I know nothing about this particular incident". ". . . . in . . . . a group movement based upon the principle of desertion from the ranks of one branch of the Church to amalgamate with another, the loss in the one and the real gain to the other is of a very questionable value. It disturbs the peace and harmony in the one and creates the spirit of condescension and patronization in the other . . . . not always even a profitable investment."

Bishop Bratton, Mississippi: "I had received a communication from the Rev. Franklin Joiner . . . . I know nothing about The Unity Octave movement . . . . I felt myself inhibited from replying to the communication."

Bishop Brewster, Maine: "No, I have not bestowed my blessing." "I am not observing the Octave personally nor have I counselled any of my clergy to do this." "I have not communicated to the Council or any of its members, my approval of the venture."

Bishop Brown, Harrisburg: Questions 1 to 3, "I have not."

Bishop Budlong, Connecticut: Questions 1 to 3, "No".

Bishop Casady, Oklahoma: Questions 1 to 3, "No". "It is hard for the far East . . . . to realize what a real wrong is done our Church in such places as Oklahoma by the well intentioned but unwise presumption of unimportant clergy . . . . " "A bunch of self-conscious clergy without jobs big enough to keep them busy were dramatizing themselves . . . . "

Bishop Cook, Delaware and Chairman, National Council: Questions 1 to 3, "No". "This flare is without sufficient representation to excite much comment."

Bishop Cross, Spokane: "The answer is 'No' to all of the three questions."

Bishop-elect Dagwell, Oregon: To Questions, "No".

Bishop Dallas, New Hampshire: To Questions, "No".

Bishop Darst, East Carolina: To Questions, "No".

Bishop Davenport, Easton: ". . . . the communication concerning the Church Unity Octave was thrown in the waste basket without being read." "Having already seen the letter which appeared in the public press . . . . "To each of your three questions I would answer 'No' ".

Bishop Davies, Western Massachusetts: "I must answer 'No' to all your questions."

Bishop Davis, Western New York: "A self constituted group of little influence . . . . they do not express the mind of

the Church. . . . Their statement is muddy and full of inaccuracies and non-sequiturs . . . . The Episcopal Church will never surrender its emphases upon democratic government, justification by faith, and other values in its Protestant heritage."

Bishop Ferris, Rochester: Questions 1, "No"; 2, "No"; 3, "By no means."

Bishop Fiske, Central New York: "No Octave of Unity for me. Some of those who think Protestantism has utterly failed might attend a sectarian service and revise their statements.

Bishop Freeman, Washington: "I have no part whatever in the Unity Octave Movement, nor have I any desire to co-operate with such an ill-advised body . . . . It is a grossly exaggerated and inaccurate statement to say that Protestantism is bankrupt morally, ethically and spiritually. Our Church has much in common with the great evangelical bodies of this country, of which it is a part."

Bishop Goodwin, Virginia: To three Questions, "No".

Bishop Gravatt, West Virginia: Answer to Questions, "I have not". "I have not". "I have not, nor do I expect to". . . . . "Deeply interested in anything that will bring about unity. I do not believe this will, but rather retard it."

Bishop Gribbin, Western North Carolina: "I have not bestowed my blessing . . . ." "I have not been making any special observance of the Octave, and I have not counselled any or all the clergy to observe the Octave." "I have not communicated with the Council or any of its members."

Bishop Helfenstein, Maryland: To three *Questions*, "No". "I think silence is the best treatment to be given to our Reverend Brethren of the Clergy and the laity endorsing their plan."

Bishop Hobson, Southern Ohio: To three questions, "No". "I have enjoyed 'The Living Church' editorials on the subject."

Bishop Howden, New Mexico: "My answer to all three of your categorical questions would be 'No' . . . ."

Bishop Huston, Olympia: To three Questions, "Certainly Not".

Bishop Jett, Southwestern Virginia: Quotations by permission of the Bishop from a letter written by him to the Rev. Franklin Joiner—"Your call . . . . is to me so amazing I cannot but feel . . . . a distinct resentment." "If you and your advisers had exhausted your ingenuity in an effort to discover . . . . an approach to this question that would most certainly insure defeat of truly Christian Unity you could not have chosen a more effective method . . . . " "You have put the Roman Church in the most unenviable position of self righteousness . . . . " "The prejudice against the Roman Church will I am confident persist until she is sufficiently blessed with that Christian spirit of humility and magnanimity that inspires love . . . . Many in the Roman Church are turning to other Christian communions. Thank God Protestantism is not yet dead certainly in this part of the world. I am receiving many members of the Roman Church into the family of the Episcopal Church. I therefore deplore and protest the methods . . . . as set forth in your letter and its enclosures . . . . The Unity Octave Council will never achieve its end."

Bishop Juhan, Florida: To three Questions, "No".

Coadjutor Bishop Keeler, Minnesota: Answers three Questions, "I have not." "I have not". "I have not". Also "I deeply regret the way in which the appeal to prayer for Unity was presented by the Church Unity Octave . . . . too many statements of a decidedly controversial and debatable nature to have made any really spiritual appeal to prayer" . . . . "The appeal has done more harm than good". "Many loyal Churchmen have been greatly disturbed by it."

Bishop Longley, Iowa: "Answering your questions, (1) No; (2) No; (3) No. I have not communicated to the Council or its members my approval of its 'venture'. My opinion is that it is a most unfortunate communication."

Bishop Mann, Pittsburgh: To three Questions, "I have not."

Quoted from *The Churchman*, January 15: Their sweeping statement that American Protestantism is bankrupt is . . . . a wild exaggeration." . . . . "the Episcopal Church is the one body which holds the key to the reunion of great Protestant Churches in the U. S. The same thing is true of the Church of England relations with Non-Conformist and free Churches of that land . . . . Organic reunion of a divided Protestantism is the task which providentially lies before the Episcopal Church. Until that is done it is idle and futile to make any further approach . . . . toward reunion with Rome."

Bishop Manning, New York: "I have no connection with the Church Unity Council . . . . "

Bishop Matthews, New Jersey:—according to his secretary, "has neither the time nor the inclination to give questionnaires the time they require . . . . is loyal, heart and soul to the Church which he serves as an officer." We assume this means "No".

Bishop Maxon, Tennessee: Question 1, "No.!"; 2, "No!!"; 3, "No!!!".

Bishop McCormick, Western Michigan: "No to all three".

Bishop Mikell, Atlanta: "No". "No". "No".

Bishop Mitchell, Arizona: "Replying to your questions—1, Nary a blessing. 2, No. 3, No and this is not all!"

Bishop Page, Michigan: "There is one outstanding fact, viz., that despite the fear in many quarters that this Church seems headed for Rome the response to this appeal has been so negligible."

Bishop Parsons, California: "You need hardly have sent a letter. You could have guessed what I would have to say about the Church Unity Octave Council communication. I do not need to write anything further, I think, because you will find in a coming number of the *Churchman* my feelings about the matter. Of course I did not say anything in the *Churchman* about being addressed as "Most Reverend". That is in itself not only inappropriate but thoroughly discourteous."

And further, quotations from *The Churchman*, January 15: "The group making this submission is in no sense representative . . . . " "Number of people in the Episcopal Church who think of reunion on such terms is infinitesimal . . . . " "The statements about Protestantism are not true". "Protestantism which includes of course Anglicanism in the English speaking world in Northern Europe, in the great mission fields and in a splendid 'saving remnant

in Germany', is doing its part with as much *real* effectiveness. In society at large as perhaps *real* religion has ever had." "Protestant Christianity is a more effective force for good in the United States than Roman Catholic Christianity in Mexico, or South America, or Spain, or even in Italy.

Bishop Penick, North Carolina: (1) "I have not bestowed my blessing." (2) "I have not observed the Octave nor counselled any of the clergy of the diocese to do so." (3) "I have not communicated my approval of the 'Venture'" "I did . . . . acknowledge the receipt of the letter . . . . and expressed my conviction that the cause of Church Unity would not be served by referring offensively to the Protestant Churches."

Bishop Perry, Rhode Island and Presiding Bishop: "I have no official or other connection with the organization named by you which naturally, therefore has not received my endorsement and blessing."

Bishop Rogers, Ohio: 1, "I have not bestowed my blessing . . . . I have ignored their appeal. I am not the least interested in absorption by Rome . . . . " 2, "I have not observed the Octave nor counseled my clergy to do so." 3, "I have not communicated to the Council nor any of its members . . . . regarding my approval of the venture, which means absorption by Rome." "I regard the representatives of the Octave . . . . an independent group with no official standing . . . . " "It is a pity that they have spoiled a lovely idea of charity and kindness by making aspersions against our Christian brethren."

Bishop Saphore, Arkansas: To three questions, "No". "With slight consideration I consigned the letter to the waste basket."

Bishop Scarlett, Missouri: To three questions, "No."

Bishop Seaman, North Texas: Answers to Question 1, "I did not bestow my blessing . . . . " 2, "I have not hitherto observed this Octave nor do I propose to counsel the clergy of this district to do so." "We pray . . . . for Christian Unity, but in the language . . . . of our own Church". 3, "I have not and cannot communicate my approval of the venture . . . . it does not seem to me to be possessed by the virtue of good faith. ". . . . particular displeasing . . . . is that the Octave starts with the Feast of St. Peter's Chair at Rome. I am not a bit interested in any of St. Peter's furniture . . . . have not found any convincing evidence that he ever had any use for a chair or anything else at Rome."

Bishop Sherrill, Massachusetts: "To all these questions I answer, 'No'. I never heard of the Octave until the recent publicity, and I have not given it, nor do I intend to give it my approval."

Bishop Sterrett, Bethlehem: My answer . . . . to the three questions is one of the shortest words in the English language and it spells 'No'. It's too bad that these brethren brought out this document for it has caused all kinds of misunderstanding and no little bitterness . . . . "

Bishop Stewart, Chicago: "My answer is 'No' to each of your three questions."

Bishop Stires, Long Island: To three Questions, "No".

Bishop Strider, West Virginia: "The answer to all three of the questions . . . . is, 'I have not.'"

Bishop Taitt, Pennsylvania: To three Questions, "No", and "I am not in sympathy with the Movement. A union of all Christendom must include the Roman Church, but the Anglican or any Protestant body would not accept the Roman claims."

Bishop Thomas, South Carolina: "I beg to say that my answer to all three of the questions is an emphatic 'No'".

Bishop St. George Tucker, Virginia: "First, No. Second, No. Third, No. I have no sympathy with that particular movement . . . . It does not seem to me that at the present time much can be done in a practical way about unity with the Roman Catholics, certainly the kind of unity there seems to be proposed in this movement which so far as I can see is not unity but absorption of our Church into the Roman Catholic Church. Such proposal would I imagine meet with no response at all except possibly with a tiny minority in our Church."

Bishop Ward, Erie: To three questions, "No". "This affair seems rather needless." "I regret the sadly unimformed and pathetically naive assumption that Rome is the only true Church." "I regret the statements about the failure of Protestantism. There are equally sad failures in other parts of Christendom."

Bishop Washburn, Newark: "I have not communicated in any way with the Council or any of its members, nor have I given it my blessing or my approval, so I do not know that the Octave will be observed in this Diocese and I have no intention whatever of counseling the clergy that they do the same." "I cannot think that any of us should attach [illegible] significance to a letter bearing the signature of a group which is so far from representing any considerable number of our people."

Bishop White, Springfield: "I have not bestowed my blessing . . . . " "I have not observed the Octave nor do I intend to. I do not think there is a clergyman in the Diocese who will observe it." "I have not communicated to the Council or any of its members my approval of the Movement."

Bishop Wilson, Eau Claire: "No, to all three questions. I know nothing of this movement."

Bishop Wise, Kansas: To three questions, "No".

Repercussions

The Press immediately interviewed Dr. Perry, the Presiding Bishop, at Providence, R. I. He seemed to fumble the issue and thought that in some careless manner the word Catholic suffered from a confused interpretation; such was the burden of his comment. Many thought that he had not read the circular, or was very casual in looking it over; or that his chief adviser brought undue influence to bear upon him. Undoubtedly, he did not sense the dimension of the rising tide of indignation that swept over our Church and through the country.

The Living Church (Jan. 11) mildly admits, "The whole matter has been most unfortunate and has received a publicity . . . . out of all relation to its importance." It suspicions that the Church would not have paid it so much attention

had not the daily press played it up so sensationally, because of its Anglo-Catholic leanings, like to forget the incident.

The American Church Monthly (Anglo-Catholic), now edited by one of the Monks of the S.S.J.E., carries on the cover under "Editorial Comment" an editorial entitled, "The Church Unity Octave." This editorial does not appear in the magazine. Apparently, it was "pulled" and in its place was substituted the title "Is All Well?" This may suggest that the Editor had some doubts as to the healthiness of the Church Unity Octave.

The Churchman (Jan. 1) administers a stinging rebuke to the C. U. O. C. circular characterizing it "A Pro-Roman appeal" and calls the group "Romanizers", "victims of wistful thinking" and carried a symposium of five Bishops condemning it (Jan. 15).

The Witness carried an editorial a page and a half long (Jan. 16) by Irving P. Johnson, Bishop of Colorado. Its acerbities and logic were completely devastating to the aspirations of this Romanizing group.

The Southern Churchman made no editorial comment but reprinted the caustic editorial from *The Witness*.

The Chronicle in this issue tells the story in its way.

Logical Deductions

The headquarters of Anglo-Catholic propaganda now centers in New York. The Octave office is shared by its brother-in-blood the secret Romanizing organization, The Confraternity of Unity. Trinity Parish, whose Rector under its charter is required to be a "Protestant minister", is seriously involved. Even after the story broke, its Parish House was used by the Octave group for a pep meeting for Anglo-Catholic laymen and one of the clergy of Old Trinity assisted at the meeting; two other of its clergy are members of the Octave Council. Rectors of two parishes, which Trinity subsidizes, are also members. We recall that some years ago a vicar of Trinity sought by indirect methods to wipe the word Protestant out of those advertising columns of the metropolitan press which carried our Church notices. The trick was discovered and defeated. A little later another vicar of Trinity headed up a movement toward Church unity with a pronounced Anglo-Catholic flavor. In this connection we recall that in 1927 Dr. Barry of the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, when he found one of his assistants, by the name of Pearce or Pierce, associated with the Romeward movement, demanded his resignation. This cleric went over to Rome and has not since been heard from.

What should the present rector of Trinity do now? And why does the present rector of Trinity imperil its endowments by defeating through connivance the implicit provisions of Trinity's charter that its rector shall be "a Protestant minister?"

It seems reasonable that The Church Unity Council, The Confraternity of Unity, The Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, The International Priests' Convention group, The Society of St. John the Evangelist (Monastic), The Order of the Holy Cross (Monastic), the "Spike" Franciscans (Monks), certain Sisterhoods and many Anglo-Catholic groups known as "Priests' Fellowships", together with such publications as *The Living Church* and *The American Church Monthly*, must be held responsible for this inevitable outcropping of these Roman aspirations.

Had not the Octave been aborted by the pitiless exposure of its activities in the public press, it is safe to assume that it would have continued its sinister activities even more impudently. This group broke Ouida's eleventh commandment, "Thou shalt not be found out."

Catholic

THIS word is much used by those of our Church who rebel against the word protestant. We find it used in connection with doctrine giving us the phrase "Catholic Doctrine", and we discover it in the collocation "Catholic Church." No one is of course so ignorant as not to be familiar with the phrase "holy Catholic Church" as it occurs in the creed.

But it should never be forgotten that Catholic here means "universal", and only that. In its supreme assurance, the Roman Church has elected to designate itself as the one Universal and true Church. That there is no such organization anyone can easily understand. So long as men see the truth from varying angles just so long will there be separate corporate religious bodies to express those points of view. And that condition will remain as long as individuals exist.

What we, and other Christian bodies, mean by the holy Catholic Church, when we employ the phrase in the Creed, is that spiritual brotherhood which finds its center in God and in Jesus. It is incorporeal and distinctly apart from any one organized society created to spread the teaching of Jesus.

Therefore to speak of the Catholic Church and simultaneously attempt to identify it with any one Church is utter folly. The Protestant Episcopal Church is an organization which postulates certain definite formularies as essential for an understanding association of certain people who seek for truth and Christian living according to certain ideals. To attempt to say that this or any other Church is alone universal is untrue. It merely presents one aspect of Christian thought.

For this reason it is well to point out that those of our friends who think the word Catholic means Protestant Episcopal or Roman Catholic are merely projecting themselves into a wishful state which is unattainable except for those who are content to live in a never-never-land.